



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,923	08/17/2006	Stefan Amon	AT04 00008US1	3761

65913 7590 06/11/2010
NXP, B.V.
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & LICENSING
M/S41-SJ
1109 MCKAY DRIVE
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER

HORNING, JOEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1712

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/11/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/589,923	Applicant(s) AMON ET AL.	
	Examiner JOEL G. HORNING	Art Unit 1712	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-10 and 20-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-10 and 20-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3-17-2010</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

1. By amendment filed March 17th, 2010, Claim 5 has been cancelled, claims 20-22 have been added and claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10 and 20-22 are currently pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 17th, 2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1712

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. **Claim 1, 2, 4 and 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka (JP-04120900, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) in view of in view of Kishima (US 4668588) in view of Fukazawa et al (JP 01193847, as shown by the Derwent English abstract).

Nonaka is directed towards a method for stiffening and improving the weather resistance of a speaker diaphragm (electro acoustic transducer) by coating it with a polymer layer. In the process, a liquid solution (70% toluene) of a polymer is spray coated (**claim 2**) onto both faces of the polymer diaphragm of a speaker so that it adheres there. The polymer is then cured by exposure to UV light (**claim 4**). Nonaka does not teach heating the liquid plastic that has been applied onto the surface of the substrate before curing it.

However, Kishima is also directed towards using UV curable polymer solutions (UV curable paint) in order to form polymeric layers (paint layers) (abstract). It teaches that after the liquid polymer layer is deposited the solvent should be removed, by heating the layer for some time, before UV curing (col 5, lines 45-58) in order to improve the surface properties of the resulting polymer layer (col 6, lines 7-12).

Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to heat the deposited liquid polymer layer for some time before UV curing it in order to remove the solvent from the layer and produce a cured polymer layer with better surface properties.

Furthermore, Fukazawa et al is also directed towards methods of effectively applying and curing UV curable liquid polymer resins onto substrates. It teaches that in order to improve the uniformity of the polymer layer formed from the liquid UV curable resin, it is important to control the viscosity of the liquid polymer before it is cured. It teaches that the viscosity is effected by the temperature and so teaches heating the liquid polymer which produces a (lower) viscosity that allows a more uniform coating to be produced (abstract).

Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to expect that heating the liquid polymer would also produce the benefit of creating a more uniform coating, since it was known that doing so would enable a more uniform coating (**claim 1**).

4. Regarding **claim 7**, as indicated by Kishima, the waiting time (drying time) is a result effective variable for determining the degree of drying (for a given solvent, volume of solvent and temperature). Additionally, drying time is also a result effective variable for determining the length of the coating process. Shorter drying times result in a faster process, but may not dry the coating sufficiently. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to choose the instantly claimed ranges of “between 1 and 15 seconds” through process optimization, since it has been held that when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. See *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Additionally, this indicates that this chosen optimal processing time would be different than the

Art Unit: 1712

optimal processing time for a process with a different processing parameters (e.g. a different amount of solvent or temperature).

5. **Claims 6 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka (JP-04120900, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) in view of in view of Kishima (US 4668588) in view of Fukazawa et al (JP 01193847, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) further in view of Brennan (US 2408038, hereafter referred to as “the ‘038 patent”).

Claim 6 further requires that a membrane or the device for applying the liquid plastic be moved during application of the liquid plastic.

Nonaka teaches spraying the liquid plastic onto the speaker membrane, but does not describe exactly how that operation occurs.

However, the ‘038 patent is also directed towards spraying liquid polymers (binder) (col 2, lines 49-52) onto speaker diaphragms (col 1, lines 6-9). It teaches that one suitable way of doing this is by placing the membrane on a turntable and rotating it (as can be seen in figure 4, the turntable is symmetrical about the diaphragm’s central axis, so it will rotate on the central axis) while spraying the liquid polymer on the membrane. By spraying the coating this way, a substantially uniform coating is produced (col 5, lines 14-20).

Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to rotate the membrane during spraying in order to produce a more controlled uniform coating of the membrane (**claim 6**).

Furthermore, the '038 patent teaches performing multiple layer deposition steps in order to produce the desired film thickness and to enable the deposition of more complex thickness profiles (masking) (col 5, lines 21-32).

Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to deposit the desired film thickness on the membrane by performing a succession of layer deposition steps (deposit and cure one polymer layer and then deposit and cure another layer) instead of a single step since it was a known way to deposit layer of the desired thickness and would produce predictable results and in order to enable the formation of more complicated thickness profiles on the rotating membrane (**claim 10**).

6. **Claims 8 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka (JP-04120900, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) in view of in view of Kishima (US 4668588) in view of Fukazawa et al (JP 01193847, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) further in view of Brennan (US 2716462, hereafter referred to as "the '462 patent").

Nonaka does not teach having a creased area that surrounds a central area of the diaphragm with different amounts of polymer deposited at these two parts of the speaker diaphragm.

However, the '462 patent is also directed towards methods of stiffening speaker diaphragms by supplying a coating to the diaphragm (col 1, lines 15-31). It further teaches that the diaphragm has a central area (body area) which is surrounded by an area (rim area) that can have creases (corrugations) in order to

Art Unit: 1712

increase the flexibility of that area. These two areas are taught to have their own separate stiffness requirements, which are met by applying different amounts of polymer reinforcement at different places on the diaphragm (using "radial filaments") so that the diaphragm will have both the proper strength in its creased area to support the body and the required flexibility in the center section in order to properly vibrate as a speaker (col 1, line 70 through col 2, line 19).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a diaphragm with a central area surrounded by a creased area as taught by the '462 patent in the process of Nonaka in order to improve the flexibility of the diaphragm.

7. **Claim 8** further requires that greater waiting times be used for a roughened surface than a smooth surface. Nonaka in view of the '462 patent shows that it is obvious to have different coating thicknesses on the speaker. As applied to claim 7 in the previous rejection, Kishima teaches that the waiting time (drying time) is a result effective variable. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to choose the instantly claimed ranges of "greater than the waiting time in the case of a membrane having a smooth surface" through process optimization, since it has been held that when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. See *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) (**claim 8**).
8. Regarding **claim 20**, because the reinforcement requirements of these two areas are taught to be separate with the required stiffness being created by the amount of

Art Unit: 1712

the polymer reinforcement applied to each area, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to then provide these separate areas with different amounts of liquid plastic material reinforcement in order to be able to produce the required strength in the creased area and the required flexibility in the center area in order to have an effective speaker **(claim 20)**.

9. Alternately, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the process of Nonaka in view of Kishima in view of Fukazawa to coat the reinforced speaker of the '462 patent in order to provide it with improved weather resistance.

Even when producing a uniform coating of the Nonaka resin over the diaphragm of '462, the amount of resin used to coat the center and the creased regions is a function of the area of those regions. Since there is no indication that those regions are required to have the same surface area and, and '462 indicates that these areas can be designed based upon "conventional diaphragm constructions" (col 1, line 70 through col 2, line 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill at the time of invention to use a diaphragm that has center and creased regions that do not have identical areas and thus to coat them with different amounts of the liquid plastic in the process of depositing even a uniform coating **(claim 20)**.

10. **Claims 9 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka (JP-04120900, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) in view of in view

Art Unit: 1712

of Kishima (US 4668588) in view of Fukazawa et al (JP 01193847, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) further in view of Bozak (US 3093207).

Claim 9 further requires that the thickness ratio of the deposited layer and the membrane be between 0.5:1 and 3:1.

Nonaka does not appear to teach what the thickness ratio should be. However, Bozak is also directed towards methods for coating speaker diaphragms with polymer layers in order to stiffen the diaphragm (col 2, lines 22-53). Bozak further teaches that the ratio of the thickness of the deposited layers and the membrane will affect the resonance of the diaphragm. The ratio should be high enough to produce the desired stiffening of the diaphragm to dampen undesirable internal vibrations, but small enough not to dampen out desired sounds (col 1, lines 23-33 with col 2, line 65 to col 2, line 11). Put another way this ratio is a result effective variable for determining the desired acoustics of the speaker diaphragm. The ratio should be large enough to dampen undesired sounds, while small enough not to dampen the desired ones.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to choose the instantly claimed ranges of "between 0.5:1 and 3:1" through process optimization, since it has been held that when the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. See *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980) (**Claim 9**).

Art Unit: 1712

11. Regarding **claim 10**, Nonaka does not appear to teach depositing multiple polymer layers onto the membrane. However, Bozak teaches that the polymer layer should be applied to both sides (twice) of the membrane in order to produce the best acoustics (col 2, lines 33-45).

Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the liquid plastic to the diaphragm and cure it a number of times (coat one side of the diaphragm and repeat the coating process on the other side of the diaphragm) in order to produce the best acoustics (**claim 10**).

12. **Claim 22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka (JP-04120900, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) in view of in view of Kishima (US 4668588) in view of Fukazawa et al (JP 01193847, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) further in view of Asif (European Polymer Journal **39** (2003) 933-938) as evidenced by the definition of "ultraviolet" (retrieved from dictionary.com June 3rd, 2010).

As discussed previously Nonaka teaches using a UV curable polymer, specifically exemplifying polyphosphazene resins with toluene solvents. Nonaka does not appear to specifically teach using UV curable acrylate liquid polymer coatings.

However, Asif is also directed towards UV curable liquid polymer coating materials. It teaches that there are many different UV curable liquid polymer coating materials known to the art, including many UV curable acrylate polymers. It further teaches that there are many different acrylate systems which enable the use of

Art Unit: 1712

water as a solvent, which avoids the environmental and legislative issues of using resin systems that use organic solvents (introduction). As evidenced by the dictionary.com definition, ultraviolet radiation is the range of wavelengths less than 400nm. MPEP 2144.05 states: "In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists."

Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a UV curable acrylate liquid polymer as a known alternate UV curable resin which was known to be suitable as a coating material and would produce predictable results. Additionally, such a person would be motivated to do so in order to avoid using organic solvents in their process and the environmental and legislative issues that would result from them (**claim 22**).

13. **Claim 21** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonaka (JP-04120900, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) in view of in view of Kishima (US 4668588) in view of Fukazawa et al (JP 01193847, as shown by the Derwent English abstract) further in view of Brennan (US 2716462, hereafter referred to as "the '462 patent") as previously applied to the alternate rejection of claim 20, further in view of Asif (European Polymer Journal **39** (2003) 933-938).

As discussed previously for claim 20, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to apply the process of Nonaka in view of Kishima in view of Fukazawa to coat a speaker diaphragm *that had already been reinforced* by the method of the '462 patent, in order to provide it with improved

Art Unit: 1712

weather resistance. '462 teaches a thermoplastic that has been softened by the addition of a solvent (col 2, lines 68-72) in order to reinforce the diaphragm. '462 does not teach using a liquid plastic that is heated to produce a more uniform distribution of the plastic.

However, as discussed previously for claim 1, Nonaka teaches that UV curable liquid polymer resins are known to be used for reinforcing speaker diaphragms, and as discussed for claim 22, Asif teaches that there are many different known UV curable liquid polymer resins used for coating materials and would be expected to produce predictable results.

Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to substitute the polymer resin used to make the reinforcing structures of '462 with a UV curable liquid polymer using the process of Nonaka in view of Kishima in view of Fukazawa, particularly one that is different from the polyphosphazene material exemplified by Nonaka, such as an acrylate material taught by Asif (**claim 22**), since it was a known coating material which would be expected to produce predictable results when applied to the diaphragm using the Nonaka in view of Kishima in view of Fukazawa process (**claim 21**).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10 and 20-22 have been considered but are not convincing in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment. Applicant's arguments are drawn to the newly amended features, so they have already been considered in the rejection above.

Art Unit: 1712

15. Applicant first argues that the UV curable paint of Kishima is not specifically directed towards coating a diaphragm of a loud speaker, so that the properties that result from removing the solvent from UV curable resins before curing them “may be inappropriate for a diaphragm of a speaker.” The examiner disagrees, Kishima teaches that when the solvent is removed from UV curable resins before they are cured they become more water resistant (weather resistance is increased) and more abrasion resistant (col 5, lines 55-59), these are precisely the properties that Nonaka desires its UV curable resin to have, moreover since these desirable properties are taught to be due to the removal of the solvent (which Nonaka's resin has) not some reaction with the specific material of the underlying substrate, the effect would be expected to be present with the process of Nonaka et al as well.
16. Regarding applicant's requirement that the heating of the liquid plastic be done in order to make the distribution of the liquid plastic more uniform, as shown in the amended rejection, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have expected such a result from heating the liquid plastic, due to its resulting reduced viscosity.
17. In response to applicant's argument that Kishima is only directed towards a particular group of UV curable liquid plastic coating materials that includes solvent, and so a person of ordinary skill in the art would not expect its teaching of how to do so to be applicable to other UV curable liquid plastic coating material that includes solvent, the examiner disagrees. These are similar coating systems, which will benefit from the same practices. Kishima presents no teaching that would cause a person of ordinary skill in the art to believe this issue is somehow unique to its

Art Unit: 1712

particularly disclosed resins, but rather indicates it is a problem of the composite of resin and solvent. Kishima further makes the connection between the existence of solvent in the cured layer and a reduction in the mechanical properties of the cured layer. It teaches method to remove the solvent from the layer before it is cured in order to avoid the cured resin/solvent composite. Unless the solvent is removed somehow, Nonaka's cured layer would also have solvent in it, so it is reasonable to expect that that its composite of solvent and resin would have the same issues which could be avoided by the drying process of Kishima.

Conclusion

18.No current claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOEL G. HORNING whose telephone number is (571) 270-5357. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5pm with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael B. Cleveland can be reached on (571)272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1712

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. G. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 1712

/David Turocy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1715